



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,121	12/29/2000	Julio Estrada	LOT9-2000-0023 US1	8745
7590 08/23/2006			EXAMINER	
Stephen T. Keohane, Esq. Lotus Development Corporation 55 Cambridge Parkway Cambridge, MA 27085			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/752,121	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ESTRADA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James H. Blackwell	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-12 and 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9-12 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 06/01/2006.
2. The original priority date is **12/29/2000**.
3. Claims 1, 9-12, and 14-19 remain pending.
4. Claims 1, 14-16, and 19 are the independent claims.
5. Rejection of Claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 5-8 are allowed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1 and 14-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialic (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,6856, filed 11/01/1999, issued 12/16/2003) in view of Salas et al. (hereinafter Salas, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,600 filed 07/15/1997, issued 05/14/2001)

**In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 14-19),**  
Bialic teaches *creating a form containing fields defining said schema and hyperlinks that point to web pages* with the creation of a Web based form (step 1050) (with some form

Art Unit: 2176

of editor). Based on the form information, the Web based form is configured for use with the database (step 1060). For example, elements of the Web based form ("Web form elements") may be created that correspond to elements of the form used in the desktop database application ("desktop form elements"), and associations between the Web form elements and fields or records of the database may be created corresponding to associations, as indicated in the form information, between the desktop form elements and the fields or records (Col. 3, lines 34-40; Fig. 4). To summarize, Bialic's invention allows a user to create a web form containing elements (*input fields*, buttons, menus, etc.) that relate to an existing database (and hence *relate to the schema or design of the database*). The web-based form is created to be eventually made part of a web server offered up to users via a web browser for inputting or otherwise accessing a database.

Bialic does not explicitly discuss that the HTML page containing an HTML form contains *hyperlinks to web pages*, though one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have found the inclusion of hyperlinks to a web page to have been obvious as it would have been common to produce HTML pages that contained hyperlinks which provided navigational assistance to other parts of the page, or to other pages within a web site, or to other web sites.

Bialic also implies that *the form is saved to local storage at said browser* in that the creation of the form is performed from within a desktop application that is normally used to interact with the database (see Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to conclude that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have desired to at least

periodically store their form/web application to local storage to prevent both a loss of their work and to allow for revision and update of the form without relying on a server's version of the form.

While Bialic does not explicitly teach *dragging and dropping said form from local storage into an upload control panel in a user interface to said collaboration space*, it is apparent from the steps of Fig. 4 that the resulting web application (containing the form) is transferred to a web server from a client via a network (see steps 1080, 1090). It is noted that dragging and dropping is a well known means for easily moving files (information) from one place to another within a windowing environment and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that one would typically use a drag and drop technique to assist in uploading the web application (containing the form) to a web server.

It is further noted that Bialic does not mention that the *server is, or contains a collaboration space*. However, a web site (or web server) would have been considered an obvious example of a collaboration space to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention in this instance as a plurality of users would have used the web application (including the form) to interact with the database, providing the benefit of a more readily accessible and common user interface.

In addition, Salas further teaches such a technique in uploading a form to a collaboration site from a client (Col. 13, lines 19-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to

Art Unit: 2176

uploading content to server environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows the user an easy means to upload files to a server; saving time in the process.

Bialic continues by teaching *parsing said form to identify said fields and incorporate them into said schema* in that a text file version of a desktop database form file is produced, and the text file version is parsed to derive database interaction information. Results of the parsing include a virtual directory at the Web server that includes one or more text files known as "ini files" and one or more files for Web forms. Such an ini file includes information such as table relationship information and database connection information that is needed in the new Web application to display and search database data (Abstract).

Bialic also teaches *integrating said form into said collaboration space; rendering said form to a user; and receiving said form from said user with new data content for said collaboration space* (see Fig. 4; steps describing that the web server is readied to accept the web application containing the form for interaction with the database). In use, the now web application can be selected by a user who accesses the web server to interact with the database (see Fig. 19, steps 2090, 2100, 2110).

**In regard to independent Claim 11**, Claim 11 reflects the method for integrating forms including fields defining the schema of a collaboration space into said collaboration space, as claimed in Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 14-19), and is rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, Bialic teaches that the forms are in HTML (Col. 4, lines 1-6). Also, Bialic teaches *rendering said form in edit mode to a user; and receiving said form from*

Art Unit: 2176

*said user with new data content for said collaboration space* in that when others place the web application on the web server for use, the form is made available to have its fields filled in (*an edit mode*) by the user of the database for accessing the database, or perhaps inputting information into the database (see Fig. 16). That form is subsequently processed by the server (*a read mode*) and the database is accessed.

9. Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialic in view of Salas, and in further view of Hanson et al. (hereinafter Hanson, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,736 filed 09/27/1996, issued 09/21/1999).

**In regard to dependent Claim 9**, neither Bialic nor Salas explicitly *teach parsing said form, finding linked files and processing uniform resource locators to generate a form object; saving to a page object said form, said linked files, and said form object; and displaying at said browser said page with said form object in read mode and said form in edit mode*. However, Hanson teaches an object comprising a web document being executed by a server, having been previously uploaded to the server from an object-oriented web editor client, and subsequently requested by a client for display (Col. 13, lines 48-57). So, the object (web page) was created by an editor and uploaded to the server as an object. The web page (object) consists of other objects (each HTML tag, for example). So, the web object (form) is executed (involving parsing) and tags are converted to whatever formats the client requests (e.g., client can request an HTML page, or other characteristics of the object) via handlers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic,

Salas and Hanson as all three inventions relate to the creation of html documents.

Hanson adds the benefit of further defining each component of a web page (such as form input fields) in the form of objects whose attributes can be manipulated.

10. Claims 10, 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialic in view of Salas, and in further view of Kagle (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,153 filed 04/27/1999, issued 08/17/2004).

**In regard to dependent Claim 10, Bialic fails to teach that *responsive to creation of a valid link to an image within an html page or skin, creating a uniform resource locator (url) by: downloading said images into a local directory in the same folder as said html page or skin.* However, Salas teaches that file download and subsequent upload, if necessary, is managed by a background daemon. Alternatively, a separately executing program may manage file upload and download; the only requirement is that the file upload/download application executes separately from the browser application, so that premature exiting of the browser program is handled appropriately by upload/download code (Col. 12, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to collaborative work environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows for uploading/downloading server workspaces to maintain local versions.**

**Bialic fails to teach *uploading said linked and download images from said local directory automatically when said page or skin is uploaded.* However, Kagle teaches**



Art Unit: 2176

that pictorial/image information can be entered as a pointer to a locally stored image, which is uploaded with the completed page layout (Col. 6, lines 53-60). Here, a PDA uploads a page layout and an image referred to in the page layout. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic, Salas and Kagle as all both inventions relate to the creation of web pages. The benefit of Kagle's teaching is to allow for more efficient uploading by uploading all components of a web site in the same upload session.

**In regard to dependent Claim 12**, Claim 12 contains subject matter similar to that found in Claim 10, and is rejected along similar lines of reasoning.

In addition, Bialic fails to teach *importing an original html file, which contains an image tag, and the related image files into collaboration space*. However, Salas teaches that file uploading may be done in the background or in the foreground. If done in the foreground the user will be blocked from further work on that file until the upload/download is complete. Once the upload is complete, the server 14 updates metadata stored in its database 20 that is associated with the file, for example, any edit lock set by the editing user is released (Col. 132, lines 60-67). Also, once the user is finished editing the file, it may be uploaded to the server 14 to allow other users access to it. The user signals that the file should be transmitted to the server 14 by *dragging the file onto an eRoom* displayed by the browser (step 704). *Dropping the file into the displayed eRoom* invokes an ActiveX control or a background daemon process, which manages the upload of the file to the server 14 (Col. 13, lines 19-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the

teachings of Bialic and Salas as both inventions relate to collaborative work environments. Adding the teaching of Salas allows for creating/updating server workspaces without interfering with other collaborators.

Salas fails to teach *parsing said original html file to find linked images; creating a modified html file by modifying said image tag in said html file to refer to the copy of the image file attached to document on the server; saving said original html file and said modified html file on a collaboration space page object*. However, Kagle teaches in Fig. 8 a process whereby template files are created on a client computer (a PDA in this case). Template files and any images, audio, etc. that are referenced in the template files are uploaded to a server. The server processes the templates and builds an html page (see Fig. 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Bialic, Salas, and Kagle as all three inventions relate to the creation of web pages. The benefit of Kagle's teaching is to allow for more efficient uploading by uploading all components of a web site in the same upload session.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 06/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 14-16 and 19), Applicants have included the phrase "extending the capabilities of ..." to the preamble and to the last limitation. However, this addition of this phrase does not appear to the Examiner as changing the scope of the claim or further define its limitations. The Applicants have provided extensive description of their invention in the present arguments and the

Examiner has a good understanding of what the invention is based on these explanations as well as how the Applicants feel their invention differs from the cited prior art of record. However, the presently amended claims remain lacking in several respects. For example, with respect to the limitations of Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 14-16, and 19), The Examiner has the following comments (based on Applicants remarks with regard to the Specification):

12. First, the limitation of *"creating a form containing fields defining said schema and hyperlinks that point to web pages"* is understood to mean that a user (any user both members of the collaboration and/or an administrator) can create a form (assumed to be a web/html form) containing fields (understood to typically refer to what is input (a value(s)) by the user as opposed to the field name) defining said schema (presumed to typically refer to a database schema from which a database (i.e. table) is created/generated) and hyperlinks that point to web pages (understood to mean that as is typical of most web pages that hyperlinks appear linking to various other resources, e.g. help files on the form inputs).

13. In the Examiners opinion, it is not clear as to who can create these forms. It is typical and well known in the art of databases adding fields (columns) to a database is left to an administrator only. Also, can users outside the collaboration group create forms for the purpose of adding fields to the database? For that matter, can any user add data to the database once the form has been uploaded to the space and incorporated into the space? Also, it is unclear as to whether or not the hyperlinks are also added to the space, or that part of the limitation is meant to indicate that the form is

Art Unit: 2176

web-based (i.e. as a descriptor) (Examiner notes that some further clarification is provided in the other independent claims that it is an html form).

14. Second, with respect to the limitation of *parsing said form to identify said fields and incorporate them into said schema*. Do the field content (input values) contain the names of the new database fields to be added to the schema (and therefore added perhaps as new columns ready to be populated) or do the field names carry that information and the field inputs are initially left blank by the creator of the form?

15. Third, with respect to the limitation (and commented on above) *extending said capabilities by integrating said form into said collaboration space* it is unclear how integrating the form into the collaboration space extends the capabilities of the space. Presumably, this is achieved by providing a mechanism for other users to populate new database fields with data as well as a mechanism to make it easy for those same users to define and add new fields (columns) to the database?

16. To summarize, the Examiner is confused in the use of the term "field" as it relates to html forms where the field is typically understood to be the value that is input by a user, but could also refer to a field name or could also be understood to refer to both the field name and its value as opposed to its meaning with respect to schemas (database, xml, or more generically a description that defines a space). Does it refer to the name of a field or field values?

***Conclusion***

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell  
08/18/2006

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**